

**Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee Meeting  
Wednesday, August 27, 2002  
Resources Building  
1416 Ninth Street, Room 1142  
Meeting Summary**

**Subcommittee members (or their alternates) and agency liaisons present:**

Gary Bobker (TBI)  
Ryan Broddrick (DU)  
Serge Birk (CVPWA)  
Walt Hoyer (MWD)  
Lisa Holm (CCWD)  
Todd Manly (NCWA)  
Ronda Lucas (CFBF)  
Bernice Sullivan (Friant WUA)  
Tom Zuckerman (CDWA)  
Lloyd Fryer (KCWA)  
John Cain (NHI)  
Marc Christopher (FOTR)

Diana Jacobs (CDFG)  
Brian Kinnear (NMFS)  
Steve Shaffer (CDFA)  
Margit Aramburu (DPC)  
Craig Fleming (USFWS)  
Dave Zezulak (CDFG)  
Patricia Rivera (USBR)  
Jeannie Blakeslee (DOC)

**Introductions and Subcommittee status report:**

The meeting began with introductions and a subcommittee status report. The summary of the previous meeting was reviewed. Walt Hoyer pointed out that the obsolete term "roundtable" on page 2 should be read to mean "workgroup."

Co-chair Gary Bobker opened discussion of the idea of meeting in places other than Sacramento occasionally. Some members of the group expressed concerns that local interests would lobby the group in support or opposition to particular projects. Others opined that the group should make an effort to learn local perspectives. The group discussed wanting to be clear about CALFED ecosystem restoration priorities by amplifying what is laid out in the draft Stage 1 Implementation Plan and also hearing first-hand how projects are working out. There were comments about the role of the Independent Science Board in assessing projects contrasted to the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee's interest in learning results of the program so far in a locality. An aspect of this discussion was the committee's interest in wanting to know the effects of ERP projects combined with other projects within a region. A short discussion of ASIPs (action-specific implementation plans) and their ability to disclose effects of projects ensued, as well as a short discussion of "regional coordinator" functions and how programmatic plans are built out of regional plans. The subcommittee is concerned that in a non-Sacramento meeting the agenda should reflect the committee's acknowledgement that the public has limited time to spend. Gary Bobker elicited agreement from the group that future meetings in towns other than Sacramento could be appropriate if the theme of the meeting was local projects and feedback. Subcommittee members would like to be presented with more information on MSCS (Multi-Species Conservation Strategy), ASIPs and regional planning/coordination. The subcommittee also requested that a reflector be established for the group to allow for better communication and advance review of agenda item briefings.

### **Ecosystem Restoration Program status report:**

Dan Castleberry explained how year 3 program assessment and work plan documents are currently being prepared and presented, including the fact that the Bay Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) will see a version of the Year 3 Program Assessment and Work Plan at their September meeting. Subcommittee members can comment on this draft to ERP staff, if done quickly, or convey comments to BDPAC.

Dan Castleberry pointed out that the ERP presently has two annual planning documents. The one that the subcommittee has in hand is the Program Assessment and Work Plan, a broad and general plan based on the legislatively authorized budget. The other annual planning document is the Annual Work Plan and Budget for Implementing the Single Blueprint for Ecosystem Restoration. This plan captures commitments the program makes during that year and upon which the regulatory agencies make their determination concerning the availability and focus of the \$150M for ecosystem restoration. Dan stated that the ERP is looking into ways to combine these two planning tools into one document, but pointed out that the budget is tracked differently for each of the efforts.

Projects to be implemented in year 3 will include many of the projects identified as “consider as a directed action” by the Selection Panel in response to the Year 2 proposal solicitation and review process. These “directed actions” will go through a technical review and selection process this fall with funding decisions late in 2002 or early in 2003. There may also be another solicitation process at the end of this year, targeting important gaps and continuing projects in need of next-phase funding.

The subcommittee discussed “high-priority” tributaries and its desire to see them benefit from the Environmental Water Program (EWP). Much discussion of the EWP ensued, with a call by Serge Birk to elevate concerns about the EWP to the full Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee. Gary Bobker asked that the group focus on moving forward, rather than rehashing old issues. Terry Mills, ERP staff, reported that the ERP has contractors working on developing an additional technical tool for the EWP, and hopes to have a report in hand soon.

Vance Russell of Kleinschmidt, a contractor working for the ERP, gave a short presentation on the status of the Projects Evaluation, Phase 2 Report (otherwise known as the look-back exercise). The subcommittee encouraged the ERP to make the report from phase 2 available soon and to move onto phase 3 of the effort.

Terry Mills of the ERP presented the Year 3 Program Assessment and Work Plan, dated August 16, 2002. Ryan Broddrick expressed concerns about moving programs from Category B to A when the status of those programs are in part dictated by the CALFED Record of Decision and other legislation. Dan Castleberry stated that summaries of all CALFED program element work plans will go to the full BDPAC at their September meeting, and that subcommittee members should get their comments in soon.

The subcommittee requested more discussion of these subjects on its next regular agenda.

### **Next steps for the Subcommittee**

The Subcommittee spent some time discussing the August 20, 2002 version of the draft document called **Draft list of desired outcomes for the Ecosystem Restoration Subcommittee of the California Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee**. Diana Jacobs opined that the subcommittee should wait for the pending State legislative decision on governance of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program before making many changes to the draft document. Gary Bobker suggested that the next version of the document could open with a statement that the subcommittee recognizes that achievement of the outcomes could be affected by resources and governance. The subcommittee discussed each of the sections of the draft document recommending revisions to each section. Most of the subcommittee agreed with the recommended changes, although Ronda Lucas stated her opposition to the use of quantitative goals in the implementation section. Gary Bobker agreed to register Ronda's dissent if the draft document was discussed at the BDPAC meeting and to distribute an edited version, incorporating virtually all issues raised before and during the meeting.

### **Action items**

1. Subcommittee requested that ERP staff establish a e-mail reflector for the subcommittee.
2. ERP staff will consider timing and location of future subcommittee meetings for each of the CALFED regions within the ERP's geographic scope.
3. ERP will deliver a presentation on action specific implementation plans at a future subcommittee meeting.
4. Subcommittee members should provide comments on the Year 3 Program Assessment and Work Plan to ERP manager and subcommittee co-chairs prior to the BDPAC meeting in September.
5. Gary Bobker will revise the draft list of desired outcomes based on comments received to date and send revised version to subcommittee members prior to the next meeting.